

REMARKS

Applicant has considered the pending Office Action and references cited and have elected to amend the pending claims to more clearly describe the inventions. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended. No new matter is added with these amendments.

RESPONSE TO FORMALITY OBJECTIONS AND REJECTIONS

Claims 22, 35 and 36 have been corrected to state their status. That objection is therefore believed to be overcome.

Claim 36 has been amended to recite a system instead of a method. That objection should be overcome.

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under section 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Amendments to claims 1 and 15 have been made to indicate that the time-stamping feature is used to “limit the ability of users to misappropriate credit for the portion of work if the work were to be resubmitted to the storage means by another author including a timestamp associated with a time of first receipt of the portion of work from the author that may be used by the system in resolving disputes regarding original authorship.” That recitation is believed to be sufficiently clear and definite to overcome this rejection.

RESPONSE TO REJECTION OF CLAIMS BASED UPON ASSERTED PRIOR ART

Each of claims 1-36 stands rejected under either 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on U.S. Patent No. 6,260,064 to Kurzrok and/or Kurzrok in view of U.S. Patent No. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the amendments made to the claims.

Specifically, each of the two independent claims (claims 1 and 15) have been amended to clarify distinctions between the present invention and the Kurzrok reference.

As amended, claim 1 recites a security means that “limits the ability of users to misappropriate credit for the portion of work if the work were to be resubmitted to the storage means by another author including a timestamp associated with a time of first receipt of the portion of work from the author that may be used by the system in resolving disputes regarding original authorship.” Similarly, claim 15 recites a method that performs that step.

Kurzrok fails to disclose such a feature. Nothing in the cited portions of Kurzrok discuss use of time-stamping to prevent misappropriation of credit for a submitted work in subsequent authorship disputes. Kurzrok has no discussion regarding authorship disputes.

Accordingly, Applicant's amendments to clarify distinctions between the claims and the art of record traverse those rejections based on Kurzrok.

CONCLUSION

Applicant asserts that all pending claims are allowable over the art of record and therefore this application is in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner allow these claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are any other fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.11 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

If the Examiner has any remaining informalities to be addressed, prosecution can be expedited if the Examiner contacts the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such informalities.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Brian M. Buroker
Registration No. 39,125

HUNTON & WILLIAMS
1900 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 955-1935

Dated: November 3, 2005